



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

tance with which will from this time on be indispensable. Its breadth and accuracy of scholarship have already been mentioned, but this we long ago learned to expect from Harnack. Another merit is more unexpected: the style is very different from that of most German theological books—different from the author's *History of Dogma*. That cannot be recommended as easy summer reading, even in its English version; but in this volume the sentences are short, clear, uninvolved, and scarcely one must be read a second time to get its meaning. Though for the most part he holds to a plain and matter-of-fact style, at times the subject inspires the author to real eloquence. Both for its form and its content, this must rank as one of Harnack's best works. It is to be hoped that a good English translation will soon place it at the service of the many who cannot now avail themselves of its great value.

HENRY C. VEDDER.

CROZER THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY.

THE RELIGIONS OF ISRAEL AND ITS NEIGHBORS.

Two books¹ have recently appeared, both masterpieces in their way, concerned with one of the most important subjects that can occupy the attention of thinking men at the present time. We live on the eve of a new Reformation. As the study of Greek paved the way for those changes of thought which went to form the Reformation and remade Europe, so now the study of the languages and literature of ancient Egypt and Babylonia is likely to revolutionize our views of the Bible. Nor can a man set aside the Bible any longer as outside the area of living thought. With the new view it must resume for a long time to come its preponderating influence as the most interesting book in the world. A fresh impulse has been given to its study that will bring it back into intellectual circles that had grown indifferent. Nor is it the Bible and theology alone that are affected. The classical culture, with its deep influence on modern life, must reckon with new material for origins. Studies that had become dry as dust by the reiterated overworking of the same limited material will be revived by

¹ *The Religions of Ancient Egypt and Babylonia.* [The Gifford Lectures.] By A. H. SAYCE. Edinburgh: Clark; New York: Imported by Scribner, 1902. vi + 509 pages.

Die Keilinschriften und das Alte Testament. Von EBERHARD SCHRADER. Third edition. II. Hälften, 1. und 2. Lieferungen, re-edited by H. ZIMMERN. Berlin: Reuther & Reichard, 1902. 345–680 pages.

the fresh evidences of an age-long background of experience and thought.

For a while, no doubt, we shall be overdosed with Babylonizing theories of everything, but we shall gain much real knowledge, and in the new setting old truths will sparkle more brilliantly. There is, perhaps, too much tendency in these books to see parallels to old knowledge. Men in similar circumstances do arrive at much the same thoughts and devices. Even the ancient American civilizations furnish striking similarities to Egyptian or Babylonian humanities. But here we have two nationalities between whom the Hebrew folk grew up. Both came into contact with Greek civilization. Where similarities can be shown to exist we shall have difficulty in denying transference.

What is absolutely necessary now for anyone who would set his knowledge of history or religion in a vital relation to the soul of humanity, and thereby give it value for modern life, must add a knowledge of what lay behind. The duration of man's written record of himself has been given an extension backward that makes us take fresh views of nearly all our old knowledge. Antiquity has become twice as old. The first half is nearly unknown, but knowledge pours in upon us faster than we can assimilate. The great thing now is to assimilate all we can. It is premature to say what it will teach us. Books like these are priceless for the theologian, philosopher, and historian.

We may not expect of them the finished judgments that were possible when the whole material was already long known and when every word had been indexed, counted, weighed. There is hardly a day but some student adds more to the knowledge of the subject. The ink is hardly dry before the last new book is out of date in some detail. We may not, however, wait for finality. It cannot come for years. There are things that touch us at all points in a very sensitive part of our life. We must master them at once, and be ready to master more as soon as they are available.

Professor Sayce once before took the subject of Babylonian religion in hand, for his Hibbert Lectures. It was easy to find fault with them, as it will be with this book, because the subject is one on which everyone has some fresh light to bring, and it is theological. But that fault-finding is not with the writer so much as with his subject. It is essential to find all the fault possible, in order that the rest may be recognized at its true worth. This is a most important book, but it is very irritating from the point of view of a student. The writer seems always to regard facts with great suspicion and only deductions with

anything like confidence. One follows him, a little annoyed at the caution with which monumentally attested facts are stated, wondering what can be the possible alternative view or reading; then comes a plump statement, apparently too certain to the author to need any evidence, and one is comforted. This must be a thing too well known for its proof to be rehearsed; all one wishes for is a reference to some work where the proof was once, long ago no doubt, given. But this is something one can quote, and looking back one can see that it renders probable much of what went before. Only, one would have been helped if it had come first. After much research, and weary looking up of previous utterances of the same writer, the student will find that this definite statement was after all not a proved theory, but meant to be a conclusion from the rather shadowy facts rehearsed before it. In fact, the author seems to have for his canon: "The things that are seen are uncertain, things that are not seen are certain."

Thus (pp. 351 f.) the reasons for thinking that kings were regarded as gods in Babylonia are set out in a way that leaves much to be desired. We may ask whether being adopted by Marduk, at the ceremony of "taking the hands of Bēl," was exactly the same as deification, and whether there are instances of a Babylonian king being called a Bēl, and, if so, whether it meant "Lord" or "lord." Sargon and Naram-Sin were "explicitly deified," we are told, but what is that? Was it only the use of a determinative of divinity before the name? The reference given only proves that. One would have liked a list of the "Semitic successors of Sargon" who assumed the "title of god," but this has, probably, one thinks, been worked out by someone. It is only singular that they so often dropped it; one looks in vain through Radau's *Early Babylonian History* for it, except in the case of certain dynasties. Of course, one knows of Hammurabi, but were the other kings of the First Dynasty deified? One feels the reserve with which the facts are treated. Now comes the blow: "But a change came with the conquest of Babylonia by Kassite hordes from the mountains of Elam; the foreign kings ceased to be divine and the title of god is given to them no more." But the contracts of the Kassite period tell a different story. At any rate, Kudur-Bēl, Šagarakti-šuriaš, and Bitiliašu II. bear the determinative of divinity before their names. Can we, then, maintain the theory that this apotheosis of the monarch was specifically Semitic? What we are really justified in saying is that Babylonian kings were treated to some extent with divine honors, and then we may set out in full the evidence of this. But we are still very much in

the dark as to what this meant. Professor Sayce's view of its meaning is to be welcomed as helping us to understand something possible.

Herein consists the importance of the book. It is full of views. These views are most stimulating. Most men cannot get on with their work without some view of what the facts they are collecting mean. Such views may often have to be abandoned when fresh facts are found to be inconsistent with them. But it would be a real gain now to a student if he could get a compendium of ascertained facts; and, if the compiler must give views, it would be a comfort to have them printed in different type, or otherwise distinguished from facts. We do not wish to quarrel with any of the views in this book. But it is misleading to use the same affirmative statement of them as of facts. If the reader will bear in mind that what reads as a result of knowledge is usually only a statement of the author's conviction, he may find this book very valuable. The author is undoubtedly deeply versed in his subject, and no man has better right to lay down the law. How often he has been right, when most disputed, is a matter of history. He would perhaps have provoked less disagreement, if he had been less positive. But discussion is not wasted on such a subject.

The difficulty of handling the subject is greatly increased by the popular style in which Professor Sayce's book is cast. The part dealing with the religion of Egypt may be sound, but where one can check the rest doubt is the lasting impression. There are many passages which shock one rather severely, but render a reply difficult, because no ground for opinion is given that can be attacked. It is, of course, impossible that a full proof with technical details should be set out, and, lacking this, no reply can be attempted. But one feels bound to enter a protest against such statements being taken as the result of rigorous proof. Thus we are told that *Enlil* belongs to the realm beneath the earth, "ruler of the spirits, whose abode was beneath the earth, or in the air by which we are surrounded" (p. 262). He is rather god of the earth, on which men live, without excluding that portion of the air in which men move. The proof of his subterranean power is not indicated. It seems to be deduced thus: En-lil is "lord of *lil*," "*lil* is ghost," "ghost is spirit of buried men," therefore En-lil is lord of things below the earth. Each step, if we have guessed the course of argument correctly, is open to question. If we grant that En is "lord" by itself, that does not prove En-lil means "lord of *lil*." There are plenty of compounds of En where it does not mean "lord" at all, but is a possibly phonetic part of the name. What proof is there that En-lil has any connection with either En or *lil*? Granting that to be likely, as likely as any other explanation of a name whose derivation may be quite different, *lil* is not proved a "ghost." To do that we must be shut up to the "spirit of a dead man." We can admit *lil* denotes a "spirit,"

but why not simply a "demon"? We are not bound to admit that "demons are really "ghosts." But granting "ghosts," do the buried have "ghosts," or only the unburied? If only the latter, the subterranean idea is gone. Each objection here raised may be argued at length, and the argument may go against the objector, but if one be maintained, where is the proof of the whole? This argument appears to be the only ground for saying that Nippur denotes "the darker side" of the early religious thought. A careful comparison of what Zimmern says under *Bēl* and *lilū* makes us wonder what the "darker side" means. Sayce (on p. 281) seems to give up the ghost idea, even its connection with man at all. The statement is still adhered to that the home of the *lil* was beneath the earth, but everything supported by reference to sources shows it to be a "demon" only. The difficulty of the derivation, "lord of the ghost world," for *En-lil* is actually pointed out in the note on p. 282. Dialectical forms are said to be *Mul-lil* and *U-lil*. How do we know *En-lil* was so pronounced, not *Ellil*, and why should not all three names then be Semitic? If so, where is *lil*, "the ghost," gone? What the ordinary man wants now is a statement by some competent person of why all these readings are concluded. If *En-lil* is only a guess at a pronunciation of the two signs, read sometimes *En* and *lil* when separate, when read together, what conclusions about "ghosts" and "darker sides" can be proved? Is *Mul* "a lord"? or *U* either?

Those who do not admit the existence of the Sumerians as a separate people will rejoice over the evident difficulty there is in separating the traces of their religion from the Semitic. The distinctions attempted between the religious ideas are often too fine to be perceived, and oftener seem to be nothing more than a separation between two ways of regarding the same words. Give a god a name and it will suggest many things to say about him, even a whole theology, if you are ingenious enough. If you find that the things said are not all logically consistent, it is easy to refer one set to Sumerian, another to Semitic. Really, that seems to be all there is in many of Sayce's distinctions. But it is not always proved that anybody ever said these things till now. It is too often what Sayce thinks they mean; we are not sure the ancients said so. Thus animism is ascribed to both Sumerian and Semitic apparently. But that any such idea was entertained by either seems to depend on giving a special sense to one or two words or signs. That one value of *zī* is *napištu*, and another *nišu*, seems the only ground for saying that there were spirits of the gods as well as of men. There seems no reason for reading *napištu*, rather than *nišu*, wherever used of God or man. There is no reason why *nišu* should mean "spirit," unless that it is represented by *zī*, which also means *napištu*. But *nišu* is often replaced by *mu*, which is read *šumu*, "name," or other words for "name." The name is interchangeable with the person, the *napištu* is the person. We need not use "spirit" at all; "name" or "person" will do for *zī* everywhere. If something was said of the *zī* which could be said of a "spirit," and not of the

living person, we should have surer ground. But you can swear by the "name" of a god, or the "name" of heaven, just as well as by the "spirit" of the same. In fact, it would need very rigorous proof to show that men swore by the "spirit" of a thing, rather than by its "name." Moreover, that *nišu* is a synonym of *lā*, "verily," seems altogether to exclude "spirit." In the star SIB-ZI-AN-NA we may admit that separately SIB = "shepherd," ZI = "life," and AN-NA = "heaven;" but that together they mean "shepherd of the spirit of heaven" is doubtful. We know that ZI-AN-NA was also part of a "palm tree," called *asitu*, very likely "topmost tip;" why could not the star be "shepherd of the zenith"? The mere fact that we have the ZI of many things does not prove any animism. What we want is a "spirit," expressed by some unequivocal sign or name, of stocks or stones, things at least which have not "life."

As a rule, where we can compare Sayce with Zimmern, the latter is a valuable corrective and a safer guide. There are many larger questions which cannot be discussed here, and Sayce is often suggestive where Zimmern is silent. Very interesting are the traces of human sacrifice. If one takes the view that such must once have existed, the traces are evident, but they all seem to be indecisive otherwise. Sayce, p. 467, still clings to his view that in K. 5139, etc., *urišu* must mean a "child." It does also mean a "kid," as it occurs in lists of "goats;" it may mean also a "lamb." Further, the text itself lower down (C. T. XVII, pl. 10, ll. 73, 74) speaks of "a white *urišu*;" a white "kid" would be valued, as they are generally black in the East, a white "child" is very unlikely. Zimmern's rendering, p. 577, is much to be preferred. As so often, Sayce's desire to analyze ideograms into Sumerian compounds and so concoct a meaning from their elements leads him into an odd error. "The offspring who raises his head among men" results from breaking up *nigsagilū*, a synonym of *pūhu*, into *nig*, "who," *sag*, "head," *ilu*, "raising." It really means "an exchange," and the line reads "the kid the exchange for the man." There are many such strange results scattered up and down the book. But, on the whole, it is full of interest, though also of traps for the unwary. The fault we find is that, owing to the writer's strong convictions and his popular style, they give us no warning. Unless, then, both Zimmern and Sayce agree, it is well not to rely on the latter, unless, of course, one can track the source and verify the translation. The excellent indexes to both books and the existence of Delitzsch's *Handwörterbuch* and Muss-Arnolt's *Concise Dictionary* is a great help.

The subject of these religions is one of the deepest importance. For we are increasingly aware of most suggestive parallels with the religion of the biblical books. It may not be too much to say that

those biblical teachings which have made the deepest impression on western thought are precisely those which seem to be common to Babylonia and Israel. Professor Zimmern makes it his duty, in dealing with the cuneiform inscriptions in their relation to the Old Testament, to point out as widely as possible the parallels between Babylonian ideas and the Bible. It is not sufficient in his view to collect illustrations of history and geography, or references to Babylonian gods, from the Bible. He compares, what is far more convincing, the close parallelism in thought. Nor does he except the New Testament. Even the gospel history is shown to contain many things which are startlingly like the things said of gods and heroes in Assyria and Babylonia. The history of religious ideas in the Bible can no longer be limited to the old range. We have already begun to learn to trace back doctrines to Jewish apocalypses. We have now to learn what ideas, and even expressions, meant in Babylonia, centuries before they appear in the Bible.

For those who study the history of doctrine, Professor Zimmern's book must long be the text-book. If they know enough Assyriology to trace his facts back into their original setting, so much the better. But they may quote his facts without reserve. They are all marshaled with extreme care and scrupulous accuracy. His fairness appears in the way he quotes whatever he has noticed that bears against the view he takes. If the evidence does not seem sufficient to him, he abstains from formulating a conclusion. But he often indicates the direction in which the evidence points. It is hardly necessary to say that many of his conclusions may have to be revised as new evidence comes to light. But nowhere does he irritate us by a view for which nothing cogent is produced. Of course, his book is very hard reading. It is meant to be studied rather than read. Every page needs careful thought and is meant to be compared with the oft-quoted originals. Some may find the multitude of references appalling, and perhaps the temptation to run down everything to its last refuge is too often yielded to; but this is a joy to the serious student and is better than glossing over weak places.

In such a mass of splendid work it is difficult to select the most valuable items. But one may perhaps instance the treatment of the name Jahwe as a model. After examining the numerous cases where *Iaū* or *Iahū* occurs in proper names and can be accepted as the divine name without doubt, he considers cases where it has been suspected in other names under such forms as '*Iba*, *Hiba*, *Jā*, or *Aia*. But he rightly doubts the occurrence in the time of the First Dynasty of Babylon. Such a name as *Iaum-ilu*, or *Iahve-ilu*,

granting the correctness of the reading, cannot prove the knowledge of the divine name *Iahve* or *Iaū*. For while, if *Iaum*, or *Iahve*, was a divine name, these would be exactly like *Šamaš-ilu*, *Sin-ilu*, *Nabû-ilu*, and similar names of the period, it could also be like *Iabnik-ilu*, *Iadib-ilu*, *Iazi-ilu*, *Iahbar-ilu*, *Iakub-ilu*, *Iakbari-ilu*, *Iamanu-ilu*, *Iambi-ilu*, *Iamlik-ilu*, *Ia'si-ilu*, *Iapi-ilu*, *Iačar-ilu*, *Iarši-ilu*, *Iašbi-ilu*, *Iarbi-ilu*, *Iašup-ilu*, *Iati-ilu*, where the first element is an adjective or verb. That such adjectives, or verbs, played an important part in the nomenclature of the period is shown by such names as *Iabadu*, *Iabi-ḥatnū*, *Iabuzatu*, *Iabišu*, *Iabušu*, *Iaduru*, *Iadaḥ-telum*, *Iadi-usatu*, *Iadiru*, *Iaḥusalum*, *Iaḥziru*, *Iaḥilatu*, *Iakkannu*, *Iakubu*, *Iakulatu*, *Iakitu*, *Iamadau*, *Iamara'*, *Iamat-Šamaš*, *Iamrum-zikum*, *Iasi-bitu*, *Iaviu*, *Iapsu*, *Iašaru*, *Iašuhatu*, *Iašupu*, *Iataru*, *Iatratu*, where the verbs which form their third person singular in *ia-* are continually found again in other names with the Babylonian form in *i-* alone. We need, in fact, to find some name like *Iahve-rabī*, where the second member of the name is a verb. Till then we have no assurance that *Iaum*, or *Iahve*, is a divine name found at this period. The name *Hali-Iaum* depends on reading the sign *PI* as *Ia*, but is supported by *Haliaum*, whose father was *Ia-PI-um*, or *Iave-um*. It is not a very cogent example, as a verb *ḥalū* might make its participle *ḥaliu*, which could be taken as a name; compare the feminine *Haliatu*. Of course, a definite example may soon be produced. We must await it.

Professor Zimmern takes the divinities of Babylonia in order and gives probably the clearest account yet given of them. More may be found in Jastrow's *History of the Religions of Babylonia and Assyria*. But here the chief points are noted with an eye to biblical narratives. After each god has been described from native sources a section follows setting out whatever biblical references can be suggested. Here is the point of the book. Not only occurrences of the god's name, in actual references to him, or in proper names, but parallels to the doctrines taught about him are collected and arranged. Thus Marduk, who, as the city god of Babylon, has more said about him than any other, is compared with Christ as the Messiah. The result is startling.

The books are complementary. Each helps the other. They are more important to get and read than almost anything to be had for the same money. They are too full for it to be possible to give a résumé of their contents. But no teacher of religion can afford to be ignorant of the facts they deal with and must form his opinions of them, if he need not accept those of the authors. These facts will form the stock in trade of the writers of a whole literature before long.

C. H. W. JOHNS.

UNIVERSITY OF CAMBRIDGE,
England.